

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 592

EC 110 483

AUTHOR Dyk, James Frederic
TITLE Directors of Special Education--Executive Directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens: Interactions and Responsibilities. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 76
GRANT G00-75-00383
NOTE 97p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Handicapped Children; *Organizations (Groups); Role Perception

ABSTRACT

The report examines real and perceived role similarities and differences between 139 directors of public school special education programs and 37 executive directors of Association for Retarded Citizens (ARC) programs. Analysis of questionnaires concerning personal data, responsibilities, and communications is presented in tables with percentage comparisons, raw data, and means of weighted response. It is explained that the study's major conclusion was that services for mentally retarded citizens would be enhanced (through avoiding duplication of services and competition for clients) by more frequent communication between the two categories of directors. (CL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED154592

EC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

G00-75-00383

**DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION--EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
OF ASSOCIATIONS FOR RETARDED CITIZENS:
INTERACTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**James Fredric Dyk
1976**

**U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Bureau of Education of the Handicapped**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James F Dyk

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EC110483

DIRECTOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION--EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
OF ASSOCIATIONS FOR RETARDED CITIZENS:
INTERACTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

BY
JAMES FREDRIC DYK

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Doctor of Education degree
in the School of Education
Indiana University
August, 1976

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the United States Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the United States Office of Education should be inferred.

An analysis of the data indicated that the job responsibilities of the two categories of directors are similar. Each director tended to perceive the other director as having a lesser degree of job responsibility. Each category of director reported infrequent communications with the other director, and neither category cited a perceived need for more frequent communications.

The investigator concluded that increased communications between the two categories of directors could help eliminate possible duplication of services, competition for clientele, wasted resources, and/or lack of comprehensive services. The suggestion was made that future research could lead the categories of directors toward clearer definition of how they might work cooperatively to achieve coordinated services for mentally retarded citizens.

Approved and accepted by: William F. Berkey, Chairperson
Dean F. Berkey
Ray J. Sweeney

DIRECTORS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION--EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS
OF ASSOCIATIONS FOR RETARDED CITIZENS:
INTERACTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
James Fredric Dyk, Ed.D.
Indiana University, 1976

Chairman and Director of Thesis: Dr. William Wilkerson

The main purpose of this study was to attempt to determine similarities and differences between two categories of local professional workers, directors of public school special education programs and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens programs. The questionnaire sought answers for three categories: (1) what are the backgrounds, training, and current activities of local directors of special education and local executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens?; (2) what are the responsibilities of each category of director and their perceptions of the other director's responsibilities?; and, (3) how do the two categories of directors communicate and of what perceived value is their communication?

The questionnaire was judged for reliability by three panels of experts, state level directors, local directors, and Indiana University faculty. The research population included directors of special education who were members of the Council of Administrators of Special Education (C.A.S.E.), and executive directors who were members of the Council of Executives of Associations for Retarded Citizens (C.E.A.R.C.). The geographic area was defined as Region Five of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin). A total of 316 questionnaires was sent with a 55.7 percent response to the two mailings.

Vita

James Fredric Dyk was born in Bakersfield, California, on October 5, 1941, the second son of Robert and Marirose D. Dyk. He completed secondary education at University High School, Los Angeles, California. During the period 1959-1961 he attended Santa Monica City College, Santa Monica, California. He then enlisted in the United States Navy, serving six years as a division officer and attack pilot; he flew 120 attack missions over North and South Viet Nam. Upon discharge from service he completed the requirements for the B.A. degree in Special Education-Mental Retardation at Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado.

During the summer of 1969, Dyk, his wife Sandra and son Russell, moved to Oshkosh, Wisconsin. Their daughter Kirsten was born in Oshkosh. Mr. Dyk began a four year teaching experience with trainable mentally handicapped children in a re-designed program housed at Grange School. During this four year period he served handicapped pre-school children and adults through service as president of the local Association for Retarded Citizens, president of the Winnebago County Day Care Board, president of the Residential Care Board, and service on two workshop boards. In these private sector services he wrote proposals which were approved for pre-school programs, workshop programs, surveys of needs, and residential care. He also completed the requirements for a M.S. degree in Special Education-Mental Retardation, at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin.

In 1973, Dyk was accepted as a doctoral trainee at Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, under the tutelage of Dr. Philip R. Jones. During this period he was afforded the opportunities of serving as Graduate Assistant to the Dean of the School of Education, serving as educational consultant to Howard T. Ennis School, Georgetown, Delaware, and serving as consultant to the state departments of public instruction in the states of Indiana and Delaware. As an on-the-job aspect of his doctoral studies Education District of Lake County, Gurnee, Illinois, for an one-year administrative intern experience.

Mr. Dyk is currently the Director of the West Central Illinois Special Education Cooperative, Macomb, Illinois.

Accepted by the faculty of the School of Education, Indiana University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree.

William B. Wilkins

Director of Thesis

Doctoral Committee:

William B. Wilkins

, Chairperson

Dean F. Berkeley

Phyllis J. Schneider

June 30, 1976

DEDICATION

May he who has chosen to limit some
of his children, be merciful enough
to guide the hands of us entrusted
with their care.

R. Wayne Mooers

This child has had his limits broadened by,

Sandra Dyk
Russell Dyk
Kirsten Dyk

Robert Dyk
Marirose Dyk

Dr. Philip R. Jones
Lawrence Vuillemot

J. Donald Monroe
Steven Hoopman
Eunice England
Mildred Jischke
The parents and children
of Oshkosh, Wisconsin

Dr. William Wilkerson
Dr. Henry Schroeder
Dr. Dean Berkley
Indiana University Faculty

Ltjg M. D. McMican
Ltjg E. B. Shaw
Ltjg C. F. Clydesdale
MARCAD M. Ahrens
Ltjg Wm. Liberty

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Hypotheses	5
Significance of the Problem	5
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	7
II. RELATED LITERATURE	9
Introduction	9
Associations for Retarded Citizens	9
The Director of Special Education	13
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	18
Introduction	18
Section 1 - Personal Data	18
Section 2 - Responsibilities	19
Section 3 - Communication	20
Questionnaire Reliability	21
Selection of Population	21
Data Collection	22
Research Design	22
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	24
Introduction	24
The Directors - Overview Data	25
The Directors - Responsibilities	30
The Directors - Communication	41
V. DISCUSSION	46
Limitations of Data	49
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	50
Summary	50
Findings	50
Conclusions and Implications	51
Suggestions for Future Research	52

Chapter

Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY	53
APPENDIX	56
Appendix A	57
Appendix B	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Respondants To Questionnaire By State	24
2. Other Administrative Experience in the Public Sector . .	26
3. Other Administrative Experience in the Private Sector . .	26
4. Level Of Formal Training	27
5. Meetings Attended By Directors	28
6. Character Of Agency's Services	29
7. Fiscal Responsibilities	31
8. Research And Development Responsibilities	32
9. Transportation Responsibilities	33
10. Law Related Responsibilities	34
11. Client Or Student Personnel Responsibilities	35
12. Staff Personnel And Development Responsibilities	37
13. Negotiations Responsibilities	38
14. Community Relations Responsibilities	39
15. Management Responsibilities	40
16. Communications Seeking Assistance	42
17. General Communication	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

When viewed in the context of man's history, professional services to the mentally retarded have a short and successful history. Prior to 1800, the best that was done for the retarded was accomplished in the secular "asylums" and the worst was, "to beat the devil out of them" (Rothstein, 1961). Today, the intensity of demand and the desire to provide have been blended into a somewhat parallel development of educational programming throughout the nation.

The demand for services has typically been raised by a unified group of parents representing the mentally retarded school-aged child. Mead and Brown (1966) suggested four possible factors for the unification of parents of the mentally retarded into the National Association for Retarded Children (N.A.R.C.) in the United States in 1950. Their cited reasons were: (1) An acute lack of community services for retarded children, (2) Popular concern regarding grossly deplorable conditions in many state institutions, (3) Stimulation of parent efforts by the opportunity of gaining a platform at the White House Conference on Children and Youth, and (4) Indications of the emergence of federal funding for programs for the mentally retarded.

Despite the relatively rapid emergence of services for the mentally retarded, there was a growing degree of parental disenchantment with the professional managing the life of mentally retarded children. Roos (1970) spoke of the "mishandling of parents by professionals,"

Professionals have tended to treat parents inappropriately in a number of ways. Professionals have tended, for example, to approach most relationships with parents as "counseling" or "therapeutic" encounters and to focus on such unrealistic goals as helping them to "accept" their child's retardation or "lift" their chronic depression. . . some professionals still harbor fantasies of omnipotence and unilaterally make decisions that will mold the retarded child's future.

Occasionally, parents are still confronted with a professional who assumes that parents are either ignoramuses or out of contact with reality, so that information supplied by them is categorically discarded.

The N.A.R.C. developed as a result of local need and activity. And, today, the local unit is still considered the basis for the organizational pattern. The philosophy is to allow local autonomy with controls existing only to safeguard the commonality of the objectives.

Katz, (1961) in his study of parent groups, described the development of the local organization from the simple to the complex. The early stages consisted of a small group of parents meeting, generating interest, and expanding contacts to others with similar problems. The next phase reflected increased numbers, sharing of personal experiences, and, possibly, formal meetings. In the next phase leadership developed leading to a formalization of needs and objectives, and a formal organization with constitution and by-laws was developed. The final phase was an increasingly complex organization with formalized and differentiated leadership roles and paid staff.

Katz, speaking of the process of establishing paid staff by voluntary organizations, said that the sequence of development is usually from part-time clerical help, to full-time clerical help, to executive director, to professional staff.

The N.A.R.C. in discussing the role of the executive director stated,

The Executive Director, in many ways is the organization. He represents the association before public bodies, governmental agencies, the press, radio and television, as well as before other volunteer agencies. He has an important role in setting the pace for association activity. The association seldom moves further or faster than its Executive Director (N.A.R.C., Walsh, 1969).

The executive director, it seems, plays the pivotal role in motivating and controlling association activities, 64 percent of which were aimed at concerns relevant to education (Krishef and Menefee, 1966). The results of this time spent aimed at educational concerns were evaluated by Kidd (1970),

Special help for children with special needs emerged in American education only as such children received special designations (categories) (and incidently emerged by and large through the efforts of parent groups rather than educators, and at the state level rather than local);

Graham (1962) cited three barriers which had to be overcome to achieve public education for mentally retarded children, (1) misconception as to purpose or plan, (2) conformity to past patterns and established beliefs, and (3) lethargy of action.

The responsibility for education in the United States is a state function. Local public school districts derive authority from the state and may do what they are given legislative permission to do. Extending into the 20th century, the legislation for the mentally retarded directed two categories of services. They were the establishment of state or county institutions, and permissive provisions for local school district effort. The advocates for the mentally retarded, in addition to facing Graham's three barriers, had to face four more, finance, facilities, personnel, and community attitude. The advocates had sought solutions at the local level

and found the barriers insurmountable. They learned that local districts were not enlightened to the provision of public school services for the mentally retarded; and, local districts would not act without a legislated mandate with state level financial support.

As a result of what they learned the advocates' efforts were then channeled to the general assemblies of the states. If the barriers of finance, facilities, and personnel were to be overcome, the states had to order local public school districts to provide and the state had to provide means for financing. By the early 1970's most of the states' general assemblies had enacted mandatory legislation or as a result of litigation the states had comparable orders for the provision of public school special education. All states had established training patterns and certification for special education personnel and many had made provisions for funding facilities.

In order to manage special education at the local level, districts usually created a position within the administrative structure. This position is often called "director of special education." Graham, in discussing the aspects of an educational program, cited four aspects as essential, philosophy, leadership, organization, and the look ahead. Conner (1961), an educator, speaking to the look ahead in parent relationships stated,

Most recently, special education administrators have begun to adjust their objectives to consolidate the gains made under the pressure of parent organizations. Although in many localities new programs will continue to make headway, the emergence of parent organizations for varied exceptionalities and the professionalization of parent groups of long standing are tending, however, to dissipate the initial momentum that has marked these efforts since 1950.

Patterson (1956), a parent, in speaking to the look ahead in relationships with professionals said,

When asked what kinds of services should be provided for retarded children my advice is "ask the parents" they are often best qualified to say what help they need, though professional persons will have to provide the "hows."

Thus, we laymen and professionals are indispensable to one another in our efforts to make up for past neglect of mentally retarded children.

Statement of the Problem

This study attempted to detect real and perceived role similarities and differences between two groups of local professional workers, directors of public school special education programs and executive directors of Association for Retarded Citizens programs. The specific questions were:

1. What are the backgrounds, training, and current activities of directors of special education and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens?
2. What are the responsibilities of each category of directors and their perceptions of the other director's responsibilities?
3. How do the two categories of directors communicate and of what perceived value is their communication?

Significance of the Problem

The 1960's were the years of legislation. Kidd (1970) gave parents credit for these successes. The 1970's are the years of litigation (Lippman and Goldberg, 1973). Parents have sought to gain access to a free and public education for mentally retarded children. In the course of this activity parents and professionals spent time in legislative chambers and courtrooms. The result was that the means had been developed to overcome the barriers of finance, facilities, and personnel.

The question then becomes, have the two groups developed enlightenment which will lead to cooperative efforts for the mentally retarded in the future?

It is this investigator's opinion that the discord which led to the courts still exists in that the roles have changed. In the 1950's and 1960's parent organizations desired to cooperate but local school districts would not. The parents sought legislation and they directed their local efforts to fill the programming void created by local district inability due to lack of mandates and finance. An advocacy situation existed. In the 1970's the schools have the tools necessary to serve school aged mentally retarded children. In getting the tools the parents said, if public education is provided for school aged mentally retarded children we will do the rest. The schools are awaiting the fulfillment of the promise given by the parents for pre-school and post-school aged children. The schools are now the advocates.

The objective of this study is to provide insights to the local directors resulting in cooperative effort to provide a comprehensive package of services to the mentally retarded citizen.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

This study was delimited to members of the Council of Administrators of Special Education and the Council of Executives of Associations for Retarded Citizens working within the states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin---the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Region Five.

The data for this study are based on questionnaire data and subject to the restrictions of reliability and validity inherent in this method of data gathering.

This study made no attempt to control for differences in:

1. History of development of services for the mentally retarded within each state.
2. Legislative provisions for services to the mentally retarded within each state.
3. Certification requirements for administrators of special education within each state.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study the terms used herein are defined as follows:

Director of Special Education:

that person who is responsible to a local school district or consortium of school districts for the provision of special education within that locale and who is working in D.H.E.W. Region Five and member of C.A.S.E.

Executive Director, Association for Retarded Citizens:

that person who is responsible to conduct the business of the local A.R.C. unit and who is working in D.H.E.W. Region Five and a member of C.E.A.R.C.

Public School Local Unit:

that identifiable governmental unit responsible for the education of public school aged mentally retarded citizens, whether a single unit district, or a cooperative effort of single unit districts forming a "co-operative unit", "joint agreement", or "intermediate district."

Association for Retarded Citizen's Local Unit:

that unit identified by the state or national A.R.C. which is responsible for defining and conducting advocacy activity for mentally retarded citizens.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This study attempted to determine any similarities and differences between two groups of local professional workers, directors of public school special education programs and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens (A.R.C.) programs. A review of publications, EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN, AMERICAN JOURNAL OF MENTAL DEFICIENCY, EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION QUARTERLY, JOURNAL OF SPECIAL EDUCATION, DISSERTATION ABSTRACTS, EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN ABSTRACTS, and SOCIOLOGY ABSTRACTS revealed no written information which linked the local public school director of special education and the local executive director of the A.R.C. Because of this paucity of directly applicable literature, this review will deal only with literature relating to Associations for Retarded Citizens, and that relating to local public school directors of special education.

Associations for Retarded Citizens

de Toqueville in his 19th century series of observations on life in the United States, cited volunteerism as one of the most unique aspects of American life. He stated that it seemed that Americans banded together most willingly to help each other, a phenomenon that he had not observed in his own country.

Roos (1971) wrote a most comprehensive discourse on the Associations for Retarded Citizens. He called its development a true "grass roots"

movement of parents coming together to form state and national units. In brief overview of the history of the National Association for Retarded Citizens (N.A.R.C.), Roos recounted:

The oldest local organization that eventually became a member of the N.A.R.C. was founded in 1933 as the Council for the Retarded Child, Cuyahoga County, Ohio. Whereas this early group attempted to help severely retarded children who were ineligible for school placement, the Children's Benevolent League was formed in the State of Washington in 1936 to assist children residing in state residential institutions. In 1939 parents of residents of New York state's Letchworth Village formed the Welfare League for Retarded Children. Shortly after World War II, a half dozen other groups appeared in such states as Massachusetts, New Jersey, Minnesota, California, Illinois, and Utah.

The American Association on Mental Deficiency hosted members of parent groups at its annual convention in 1947, 1948, 1949, and 1950. Parents attending the 1950 convention in Columbus, Ohio, resolved to convene a national organizing convention the following October in Minneapolis, where representatives of approximately 20 groups from 13 states officially founded the National Association of Parents and Friends of Retarded Children. In 1952, the name of National Association for Retarded Children was adopted. (Note: In 1974 the N.A.R.C. changed its name to National Association for Retarded Citizens.)

Mead and Brown (1966) suggested four factors they considered responsible for the appearance of the N.A.R.C. in the United States:

1. an acute lack of community services for retarded children
2. popular concern regarding deplorable conditions in many state institutions
3. stimulation of parent efforts by the opportunity of gaining a platform at the midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth
4. indications of potential federal funding of mental retardation programs.

Roos, in support of Mead and Brown's four points, stated:

Hence, although the socioeconomic conditions in America may have been particularly conducive to the development of parent associations, a combination of hope and parent frustration probably served as impetus for parents to reach strength through unity.

Dybwad (1963), Katz (1961), and Segal (1970) all cited the uniqueness and power of the N.A.R.C. as being founded in its grassroots development and parent control. A report to the 1967 Strasbourg symposium of the International League stated:

A successful national organization for mentally handicapped children is likely to be one with its origins in the concern of parents for their children, and it follows that the majority of its members will themselves be parents of mentally handicapped children. . . Because of the nature of the national society---that is a parent organization depending for its initiative on the concern of parents for their children---the national movement must be democratic and so constructed that control by parents is clear at every level (in Roos, 1970).

In 1952 the N.A.R.C. reported that local units were totally under parent control with the only employees being employed to provide direct service to children. Katz, in discussing how groups mature, described the process as:

1. small groups of parents generating interest in reaching more people with similar interests
2. larger groups still informally organized but conducting and deriving mutual support
3. leadership from within leading to formal organization with constitution and by-laws
4. paid staff.

By the end of the 1960's the N.A.R.C. reported that 359 of the 1400 member units had an executive director. Roos spoke of the complexity of the relationship between these paid professionals and the volunteers:

The relationship between volunteer members and paid staff is complex and at times fraught with difficulty. Dangers of mishandling parents have already been discussed. Staff need to be particularly sensitive to the volunteers' needs and must be careful not to usurp their functions and activities. As previously noted, decreased member participation may occur as paid staff assumes responsibilities formerly held by members. On the other hand, the professionalism introduced into association by competent staff can greatly enhance the effectiveness of the organizations.

One of the ways that paid staff contributed to the local A.R.C. unit was in the development and management of direct service programs. While recognizing the need for local A.R.C. units to provide when services were not available, Roos warned:

Local associations are tempted to develop service programs and, once these are developed, are reluctant to turn them over to other agencies. . . which are often delighted to let the parents' association continue to operate services indefinitely. If the tendency of local associations to provide services increases, their functions of monitoring the quality of services and pressing for improved community services are likely to dissipate. Such a trend would ultimately change the entire complexion of the delivery of mental retardation services into a system where the consumers are also the operators and administrators of programs.

This provision of direct services requires the attention of people and the expenditure of resources.

The problem that exists for the administrators of local A.R.C.'s and public school special education seems to have evolved into:

1. if the A.R.C. acts as an advocate, what are the proper roles of the two categories of directors?
2. if the A.R.C. acts as a provider of services, what are the proper roles of the two categories of directors?

Miller and Rein (1969), in speaking of citizen participation as an adversary force, stated,

Although citizen participation is a positive development, it has created a new set of demands on administrators and require the development of perspectives and techniques that traditionally have not been associated with public administration.

Social Work (1973), in speaking of the delivery of services by volunteer organizations, stated, "(We) predict that the future interorganizational environment of voluntary service organizations will be turbulent." The statement continued that relationships with other organizations, volunteer and bureaucratic, may be the measure of success of such organizations. And, the measure of success of the administrators of the two types of organizations may well be determined by how well they manage such relationships.

The Director of Special Education

de Toqueville also considered the system of public education in the United States as somewhat unique. While public education in the United States had its roots in the English form of education, he noted that no other country offered as wide and varied a curriculum, had as many unique administrative arrangements, had as many varied financial arrangements, nor had as varied a pattern of laws governing education as found in the United States.

Weisgeier and Sloat (1970) provided an historical overview of the position of public school director of special education:

As early as 1928 Ayer and Barr found that 16 major cities employed 29 supervisory and six directors of special instruction. Their study involved 44 cities with populations of over 100,000 offering public school special classes. According to Connor (1963) the first college course for administrators of special education was offered at Teachers

College, Columbia University, in about 1906-1907. Despite this early beginning, Baker reported in 1944 that with the exception of a very few special schools the administration of special education was in the hands of regular school administrators.

Willower (1970) reviewed the status of research and theory in special education administration:

Special education administration is something of a virgin untouched by the concerns with organization theory, social systems, bureaucratization, and so on, that have become so salient in the literatures of educational administration, business administration, public administration, and the several other social sciences that deal in one way or another with organizational behavior.

The research in the area of special education administration has been centered on two questions: (1) What do directors of special education do?; and (2) What are the problems faced by directors of special education?

An early "what do they do" study by Mackie and Engle (1956) resulted in a broad definition of the responsibilities of directors of special education. The sample for the study included 103 directors and 50 supervisors of special education from 24 states. The participants were asked to rank a list of 36 competencies which were suggested as important. The directors ranked leadership ability as number one. Other competencies deemed important were public relations, finance and budget, research, and staff development. The study also sought to identify how the directors spent their working time. The results are listed below:

1. Administrative duties (40%)
2. Supervisory duties (23%)
3. Direct service to children (14%)
4. Public relations (11%)

5. Inservice (6%)

6. Research (6%)

Newman (1970) surveyed 100 randomly selected public school districts with pupil populations between 13,000 and 30,000. She used Urwick's POSDCORB functions (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting) to study the tasks actually performed and the tasks which ideally should be performed. The results indicated no significant differences between what was being done and what ideally should be done. An overview of some of the tasks which were indicated as needed in the administration of special education follows:

1. To plan and provide adequate educational classes and services needed by individual districts
2. To coordinate the various services that are available within the community
3. To formulate the structure through which communication will flow in all directions including communication within the school structure and with parents and community
4. To assist in securing the necessary teaching and ancillary personnel for carrying out the processes of special education
5. To make the necessary decisions involving the educational processes and to serve as the instructional leader
6. To compile and complete the local and state accounting and reporting forms
7. To assist in the fiscal planning and implementing of funds for special education classes and services
8. To conduct research to assist in determining the appropriateness and successes of the classes and services
9. To bring about the dissemination of current research findings through appropriate inservice meetings, workshops, or other means of directly involving the special education personnel
10. To continually evaluate the curricular approaches and the pupils' responses to these approaches and to evaluate the appropriateness of the special education personnel.

The hindrances to doing what directors of special education are supposed to do may be found in the "what are the problems faced by directors of special education" studies. Wisland and Vaughn (1964) surveyed directors in 13 western states. The objective of their survey was to identify the ten most significant problems in the administration of special education programs. In brief overview, Wisland and Vaughn found that the problems ranked as most severe were:

1. adequately providing an educational program for all exceptional children
2. finance
3. education of the public.

Marro and Kohl (1972) reported on a study of 1066 administrators of special education. One of the facets of this broad study was the identification of "roadblocks to administrators" which were identified as:

1. central office demands
2. lack of assistance
3. lack of finance
4. lack of clerical help
5. lack of authority to implement responsibilities.

It is noteworthy that they also reported that directors of special education were paid \$2,00 to \$4,000 less than building principals. As a result of their research Marro and Kohl spoke to the demands on the director in the future. The demands they cited include:

1. an increase in the number and diversity of programs
2. higher goals and standards for the director
3. higher student enrollments

4. capturing and managing federal dollars
5. continuing lack of authority.

The Council for Exceptional Children (1971) added to the list of demands:

The district has major responsibility for the quality of its special education programs and for coordination with other agencies to achieve comprehensive child-centered services.

The measure of success of programs for mentally retarded citizens may be measured in the future based on the ability of managers to meet the demands as cited, especially the manager's ability to communicate with others who can assist in the achievement of his job responsibilities.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study attempted to determine any similarities and differences between two groups of professional workers, directors of special education, and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens. The specific questions were: (1) What is the background, training, and current activities of the directors? (2) What are the responsibilities of each category of their perceptions of the other director's responsibilities? (3) How do the directors communicate and of what perceived value is their communication?

Based on these questions, the questionnaire was developed in three sections, Section 1 - Personal Data, Section 2 - Responsibilities, and Section 3 - Communications.

Section 1 - Personal Data

The questions in this section were derived from the research instruments used by Schröder (1971) and Kohl and Marro (1971). Each of these researchers sought information concerning public school directors of special education. Due to the projected unique backgrounds of executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens and the services that that organization might offer, the personal data section was designed to allow each respondent to react from his own unique set of experiences. Questions were also asked herein, which focused on the perceived nature of each

organization, and, the type of meetings each respondent attended within and outside of his organization.

Section 2 - Responsibilities

The questions utilized in this section were derived from Waters (1974). In his study, he evaluated the perceptions of employing officials and graduates toward the competencies required of that of the potential administrator of special education. Waters utilized the 15 content areas of knowledge and 79 dependant functions for administrators of special education training programs as found within the 1966 Council of Exceptional Children's Professional Standards Project Report. He developed specific competencies within the content areas based on the Graff and Street (1956) "Critical Tasks of Administration" model. Waters sought information pertinent to curriculum development, research techniques, fiscal procedures, staff development, transportation, student personnel, law staff personnel, collective negotiations, community relations, school plant, social environment, and total educational process.

The responsibility questionnaire developed by this investigator and subsequently reviewed by three juries included nine administrative responsibility categories:

1. Fiscal responsibilities
2. Research and development responsibilities
3. Transportation responsibilities
4. Law related responsibilities
5. Client or student personnel responsibilities
6. Staff personnel and development responsibilities

7. Negotiations responsibilities
8. Community relations responsibilities
9. Management responsibilities

Each of the responsibility categories (e.g. management responsibilities) was subdivided into a number of more specific responsibilities (e.g. develop strategies for future programs or services). This section of the questionnaire had 45 specific responsibilities.

Section 3 - Communication

The questions utilized in this section were derived from the concepts of Mintzberg (1966). He stated,

The operating work of the organization--producing a product, undertaking research, serving a client--is seldom undertaken by the manager. The manager's productive output can only be measured in terms of information, a great part of which is transmitted verbally.

Mintzberg hypothesized that the manager has five media at his command, mail (documented), telephone calls (purely verbal), unscheduled meetings (informal face-to-face), scheduled meetings (formal face-to-face), and tour (observational).

Within the general communication subsection perceived quality of communication questions were asked (e.g. do you feel that communications with the other director have provided a good working relationship between the two of you?).

Questionnaire Reliability

Kerlinger (1973) recommended that the reliability of a questionnaire be established through the inter-judge reliability process. This questionnaire was subjected to a four phase inter-judge reliability process. The first draft was submitted to the researcher's doctoral research committee. The resultant changes were incorporated, and a second draft was written. The second draft was distributed to a panel of local directors of special education and local executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens. Six of these individuals were recent doctoral graduates four were of varying research and formal training backgrounds. The third draft was developed as a result of the editorial input of this panel. The third panel was comprised of three state level directors of special education and three state level executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens. Four of the six state level directors responded. Their input was incorporated into a final draft which was approved by a university level panel of experts, the investigator's doctoral research committee.

Selection of Population

The two categories of participants each have a national professional organization. The directors of special education may belong to the Council of Administrators of Special Education (C.A.S.E.). The executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens may belong to the Council of Executives of Associations for Retarded Citizens (C.E.A.R.C.). A letter was sent to the national president of each professional organization describing the objectives of this study and requesting endorsement of the

study as well as approval to utilize their membership lists to derive the population for this study. Both presidents responded affirmatively.

The geographic area to be investigated was defined as Region Five of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which included states of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. A letter was sent to the six state leaders in each professional category requesting a list of names of the directors of special education or executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens in their state.

The lists supplied were then compared to the membership lists of the national professional organizations. Non-members as well as those outside the six state region were eliminated and the research population was thus identified.

Data Collection

An explanatory letter, instructions for completing the questionnaire, the questionnaire, and a stamped return envelope were mailed to the 310 participants in the first week of October 1975. A cut-off date of October 31, 1975, was set within the letter. A follow-up letter with the instructions and questionnaire was mailed to those who had not responded by November 15, 1975.

Research Design

The data generated by this study relate two variates (directors of special education and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens) to eleven criterion variables (the nine responsibility categories, frequency of communication, and quality of communication).

In analyzing the data of this status study the tabulated result and percent comparisons as utilized by Kohl and Marro (1971) were used to compare the responses of the participants.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The analysis of data presented is based on returns from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Region Five.

TABLE 1
RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY STATE

	Sent		Percent
Indiana			
Directors of Special Education	61	35	57.4
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	30	16	53.3
Illinois			
Directors of Special Education	50	33	66.0
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	13	9	69.2
Michigan			
Directors of Special Education	62	32	51.6
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	10	4	40.0
Minnesota			
Directors of Special Education	22	13	59.1
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	10	4	40.0
Ohio			
Directors of Special Education	16	7	43.8
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	2	1	50.0
Wisconsin			
Directors of Special Education	36	19	52.8
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	4	3	75.0
Total			
Directors of Special Education	247	139	56.3
Executive Directors of A.R.C.	69	37	53.6
Overall	316	176	55.7

The data in this section are reported in tabular form with the percentage based on respondents to that question noted in parenthesis. The total number of respondents to each question is noted below each table.

Two questions in this section produced data which were not reportable:

Question 6 - What was the job title of your most recent past employment situation?

Question 10 - My service area has a population of:
school age, school age mentally retarded.

The wording and format of these questions led the directors to interpret the questions in a variety of ways which resulted in a variety of responses. Data from all other questions are reported below.

The Directors - Overview Data

Data were sought which might provide insight into the backgrounds, training, and current activities of local directors of special education and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens. The responses indicate little differences between the two categories of directors in background data concerning,

1. the length of service of the directors in their present position (Table A - Appendix B).
2. the sex of the directors (Table B - Appendix B).
3. the ages of the directors (Table C - Appendix B).
4. the actual occurrence of a mentally retarded child in the director's family (Table D - Appendix B).

The responses which provide overview data about the backgrounds of the directors and which do reflect some differences between the two categories of directors are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

TABLE 2

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Director of Special Education		Executive Director-A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
75	57	16	16
(56.8%)	(43.2%)	(50.0%)	(50.0%)
N=132		N=32	

TABLE 3

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE IN THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Director of Special Education		Executive Director-A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
18	113	12	19
(13.7%)	(86.3%)	(38.7%)	(61.3%)
N=131		N=31	

Table 2 indicates little difference between directors in public sector experience. Table 3 indicates a 25 percent difference between the directors in private sector experience.

The responses which provide overview data in the training of the two categories of directors are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

LEVEL OF FORMAL TRAINING

	Director of Sp. Ed.	Ex. Director-A.R.C.
High School Graduate		4 (12.1%)
Bachelor's		12 (36.4%)
Master's	84 (68.3%)	15 (45.5%)
Specialist's	18 (14.6%)	
Doctor's	21 (17.1%)	2 (6.1%)
	N = 123	N = 33

Additionally, directors of special education report certification by a department of public instruction significantly more than do the executive directors (Table E - Appendix B). Those executive directors who have certification are most frequently certified in special education; the directors of special education have certification most frequently in administration (Table F - Appendix B).

The responses which provide overview data to the current activities of the two directors are summarized in Table 5.

TABLE 5
MEETINGS ATTENDED BY THE DIRECTORS*

	Director of Sp. Ed.			Ex. Director-A.R.C.		
	often	sometimes	never	often	sometimes	never
School Board	77 (39)	57 (8)	1	1	17	13
A.R.C. Board	9 (1)	34	62	27 (25)	3	2
A.R.C. Membership	16 (1)	48	41	27 (22)	4 (1)	1
City Council	3	47	56	1	21 (1)	11
County Board	10 (4)	42 (1)	57	4 (1)	19 (1)	10
State Legislative Committee	15 (1)	70 (1)	26	4	22	7
Local Committee for Ex. Citizens	46 (2)	67	8 (1)	8	11	14
Local Service Club	46 (1)	69	7	8	20 (1)	3
Joint Agreement Board(s)	63 (48)	20 (2)	28	3 (3)	7	22

* Note - the numbers in parenthesis represent the number of directors who report that meeting as mandatory to the job

Table 5 indicates that 0.9 percent of special education directors are required to attend Association for Retarded Citizens meetings. Approximately ten percent attend the A.R.C. meetings "often" of their own volition. Less than ten percent of the executive directors attend school board or joint agreement board meetings "often".

TABLE 6
CHARACTER OF AGENCY'S SERVICES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	Weight	Rank	Weight	Rank
educational	1.44	1	4.33	1
central referral agency	3.66	2	5.64	7
vocational training	3.96	3	4.91	5
advocacy	4.46	4	5.03	6
parent training	5.07	5	4.58	2
community education	5.37	6	4.79	3
rehabilitative	5.47	7	4.85	4
summer activities	6.18	8	6.62	10
recreational	6.57	9	5.69	8
total family support	6.67	10	6.44	9
protective services	7.72	11	8.03	12
financial aid	8.10	12	9.58	14
legal aid	8.80	13	9.47	13
residential	9.09	14	7.44	11
N=132		N=32		

Data in Table 6 are reported in means of weighted responses and rank order. Directors of special education ranked "educational" as highest in priority; "central referral" and "vocational training" were also listed as priorities of the public school directors. The executive directors did not rank any specific listed agency service as high priority. Their highest ranking was also "educational."

Less than 10 percent of the directors reported that services had been the subject of litigation (Table G - Appendix B). The directors of special education have been threatened with litigation more than twice as often as the other director (Table M - Appendix B). Both categories of directors report "parents" as the most frequent plaintiffs in the litigation actions (Table I - Appendix B); changes in practices or procedures as a result of litigation or the threat of litigation are reported by both directors (Table J - Appendix B).

The service area and population bases of the agencies indicate that executive directors tend to serve an area with a larger population base. The service areas reported by both categories of directors seem to have nearly equal urban-rural characteristics (Table K - Appendix B).

The overview data indicate that the directors are significantly different in their formal training. Neither set of directors indicate attendance at the organizational meetings of the other director. The directors indicate a similarity in the objective of their agencies as "educational". The question, then, if their service areas and objectives of service are similar, are their responsibilities also similar?

The Directors - Responsibilities

The data in this section are reported in means of the total responses to each question in reacting to "what I do (self)" and "what I think he does (other)". The weights assigned to responses were:

prime importance	---	5.0 factor
(unlabeled)	---	4.0 factor
median importance	---	3.0 factor

(unlabeled) --- 2.0 factor

no importance --- 1.0 factor

TABLE 7
FISCAL RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Administer agency or systems budget	4.41	4.46	4.81	3.74
2. Develop accounting procedures for funds expended in the operation of programs	3.70	4.05	4.24	2.97
3. Translate program(s) into an annual budget	4.52	4.53	4.59	3.84
4. Develop and administer state or federal grant-in-aid proposals	3.98	4.15	4.29	3.81
Total mean	4.15	4.30	4.48	3.59

N =

132

32

The data within Table 7 indicate that executive directors of A.R.C.'s have more responsibility in the development of accounting procedures, response two, (D.S.E.-3.70, A.R.C.-4.24) and, is perceived by the director of special education as having such responsibilities (4.05). The executive directors of A.R.C.'s perceive directors of special education as having little responsibility in this area (2.97); their perceptions are somewhat supported by the directors of special education re-

TABLE 8
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Conduct formal research concerning your services	3.16	2.97	2.74	3.44
2. Identify sources and requirements for external funding	3.69	4.33	4.74	3.38
3. Apply the results of research	3.94	3.62	3.62	3.81
4. Develop appropriate curriculum guides for courses of experience	4.14	3.00	3.10	4.16
5. Implement innovative projects	4.13	3.88	4.13	4.13
6. Plan for continuous evaluation of curriculum	4.57	3.37	4.21	4.53
Total mean	3.94	3.53	3.76	3.91

N =

132

32

The data within Table 8 seem to indicate that directors of special education have responsibility for curriculum (4.14) and are perceived by the other director as having such responsibility (4.16). In the same category of response, the executive directors are perceived as having less responsibility (3.00), a perception supported by the actual responsibilities reported (3.10). Directors of special education perceive the other director as having less responsibility for innovation.

(3.88) and curriculum evaluation (3.37) than actually reported by executive directors (4.13, and 4.21).

TABLE 9
TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Assess transportation needs	3.76	3.42	3.97	3.74
2. Arrange for the selection, training, and supervision of personnel who perform the functions of the transportation system	2.59	2.86	2.97	2.67
3. Prepare transportation schedules	2.36	2.69	2.81	2.48
Total mean	2.90	2.99	3.25	2.96
N =	132		32	

The data within Table 9 indicate that the executive director is perceived as having more responsibility in this category than does the director of special education. This perception is supported by the data which indicate actual responsibility as D.S.E.-2.90; A.R.C.-3.25.

TABLE 10
LAW RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Comply with and enforce state standards for the program operation and certification	4.82	3.96	4.66	4.58
2. Stimulate the development of needed legislation	3.84	4.43	4.50	2.90
3. Be conversant in the history, issues, and philosophy of law as it applies to mentally retarded citizens and program operation	4.24	4.60	4.34	3.84
4. Participate in the interpretation of law into rules and regulations	4.54	4.14	4.16	3.45
5. Lobby	3.31	4.23	3.69	2.29
Total mean	4.15	4.27	4.27	3.41

N =

132

32

The data within Table 10 indicate that directors of special education report responsibility to stimulate the development of legislation (3.84) at a higher level than perceived by the other director (2.90). Neither set of directors reports lobbying responsibilities as of prime importance (D.S.E.-3.31, A.R.C.-3.69). Directors of special

education perceive executive directors as having more lobbying responsibilities (4.23) than actually reported (3.69). And, executive directors perceive the other director as having less lobbying responsibilities (2.29) than actually reported (3.31). The total mean indicates a wide disparity between the perception of the executive directors and the actual reported responsibilities of the directors of special education in Law Related Responsibilities.

TABLE 11
CLIENT OR STUDENT PERSONNEL RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Organize arrangements for effective counseling and guidance of clients and/or families	3.83	4.25	4.23	3.69
2. Develop a functional system of evaluating client development	4.11	3.96	4.13	4.19
3. Develop a functional system of reporting client development	4.18	3.88	4.00	4.19
4. Establish methods for coordination of services through cooperative community agencies	3.95	4.41	4.65	3.69
5. Develop procedures for identifying children needing special programs	4.74	3.83	4.29	4.36
6. Develop policies for the management of students or client records	4.67	3.74	4.32	4.03
Total mean	4.25	4.01	4.27	4.05

N =

132

32

The data within Table 11 indicate that the executive director (4.25, 4.23) is viewed as being more responsible for counseling and guidance of clients and/or families than the director of special education (3.83, 3.69). The executive directors (4.41, 4.65) are viewed as more responsible for coordinating services with other community agencies than the director of special education (3.95, 3.69). The directors of special education view the other director as having less responsibility (3.74) for records than the actual reported responsibility by the executive directors (4.32).

TABLE 12
STAFF PERSONNEL AND DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Plan for recruitment, placement and transfer of staff	4.61	3.84	4.55	4.00
2. Evaluate personnel	4.51	3.94	4.69	4.35
3. Insure awareness of professional standards and ethics	4.56	4.23	4.69	4.45
4. Develop and review personnel policies	4.08	3.74	4.59	3.03
5. Motivate staff to seek professional growth experiences (eg. classes, workshops, conferences...)	4.35	3.93	4.50	4.03
6. Identify need and be involved in planning for in-service training	4.48	3.90	4.41	4.13
7. Maintain personnel records	3.73	3.51	4.06	3.16
Total mean	4.33	3.87	4.50	3.88

N =

132

32

The data within Table 12 indicate that both directors report themselves as having a high level of responsibility in this category (D.S.E.-4.33; A.R.C.-4.50); each director views the other director as having considerably less responsibility.

TABLE 13
NEGOTIATIONS RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Participate in program or service oriented negotiations with other professional organizations (eg. N.E.A. AFL/CIO, . . .)	2.68	2.74	2.74	3.18
2. Participate in professional salary and wage related negotiations with system personnel	2.92	3.04	3.84	3.16
3. Communicate the needs of the negotiating body to a governing board or school board (eg. formal presentation, written report, ...)	3.14	3.28	3.78	3.22
Total mean	2.91	3.02	3.45	3.18
N=	132		32	

The data in Table 13 indicate the lowest overall reported and perceived responsibilities of any category probed. It was the only category where one of the directors is perceived as having considerably more overall responsibility than that director actually reported having.

TABLE 14
COMMUNITY RELATIONS RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Carry out a continuous program of community education to professional and lay people (eg. speeches, films, speakers bureaus,...)	3.82	4.58	4.50	3.30
2. Develop appropriate publications, brochures, and other written materials communicating agency or system services to the local public	3.87	4.51	4.41	3.03
3. Promote understanding of and support for programs for mentally retarded citizens through speeches	3.84	4.68	4.48	3.39
4. Establish channels of communication for interpretation of programs to parents	4.53	4.49	4.53	4.02
Total mean	4.20	4.57	4.48	3.44
N =	132		32	

The data within Table 14 indicate that both directors feel that the executive director has more responsibility for a continuous program of community relations than does the director of special education. The response to interpretation of programs to parents indicates a feeling and perceived feeling of responsibility of near equal magnitude for both di-

TABLE 15
MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

	Director of Sp. Ed.		Ex. Director-A.R.C.	
	self	other	self	other
1. Develop strategies for future programs or services	4.77	4.50	4.82	4.56
2. Plan strategies when working with large bureaucratic organizations	4.16	4.33	4.41	3.94
3. Analyze who holds the power in specific situations	4.29	4.45	4.59	3.97
4. Draw upon other's expertise to aid in planning	4.60	4.61	4.69	4.10
5. Establish and evaluate management objectives	4.45	4.13	4.77	3.90
6. Coordinate the expenditure of various resources	4.53	4.32	4.72	3.94
7. Motivate staff to accomplish organizational objectives	4.66	4.38	4.75	4.26
Total mean	4.49	4.39	4.68	4.10

N =

132

32

The data within Table 15 indicate that each director reports having a relatively high level of management responsibility and perceives the other director as having almost as high a level of responsibility.

The responsibility data indicate that the two categories of directors report nearly comparable responsibilities and consistently perceive the other director as having less responsibility than actually reported. The question, then, if service areas, objectives of service, and responsibilities are similar, how do the two categories of directors communicate and what is the value of their communication?

The Directors - Communication

The data in this section are reported in tabular form. The responses by both categories of directors to questions concerning actual frequency and desired frequency resulted in data which led to the same interpretation. Table 16 is included as depicting a set of responses to frequency or desired frequency of communication. Other tables representing data relevant to the frequency or desired frequency may be found in Appendix B.

TABLE 16
COMMUNICATIONS SEEKING ASSISTANCE

	Director of Special Education								Executive Director - A.R.C.							
	Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency			Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency		
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none
Tele-phone	7	6	6	60	27	25	60	12	3	1	1	21	6	11	19	2
Written	4	3	5	49	38	25	55	11	0	0	0	15	17	10	16	5
In-person	7	7	5	55	30	25	58	9	2	1	1	19	9	11	17	3

As illustrative of other tables in actual frequency and desired frequency of communication (Tables L, M, N, O, P - Appendix B) the data within Table 16 indicate that both directors most frequently communicate in the "sometimes" category with the other director. Both directors consider their communications to be "adequate in number" with the other director.

TABLE 17

GENERAL COMMUNICATION

	Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
	yes	no	yes	no
1. In the past year could problems have been averted with better communication with the other director?	52 44.8%	64 55.2%	20 66.7%	10 33.3%
2. Have your programs for the mentally retarded been enhanced as a result of communication with other director?	78 65.5%	41 34.5%	21 67.7%	10 32.3%
3. Do you think you could better evaluate your programs for the mentally retarded as a result of increased communication with the other director?	73 64.5%	48 39.7%	26 83.9%	5 16.1%
4. Do you think you might better evaluate the community needs for services to mentally retarded citizens with increased communication with the other director?	89 74.8%	30 25.2%	26 83.9%	5 16.1%
5. Do you initiate most communication between the schools and the A.R.C.?	50 45.5%	60 54.5%	21 67.7%	10 32.2%
6. Do you think the other director should communicate with you more often?	56 52.8%	50 47.2%	26 83.9%	5 16.1%
7. Have you implemented any change in your programs as a result of communication with the other director?	65 56.0%	51 44.0%	14 45.2%	17 54.8%
8. Do you feel that communications with the other director have provided a good working relationship between the two of you?	87 77.7%	25 22.3%	19 61.3%	12 38.7%

TABLE 17 (Continued)

	Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
	yes	no	yes	no
9. Are your communications with the other director primarily as a result of membership on the other director's program advisory committee?	16 13.7%	10 86.3%	3 9.7%	28 90.3%
10. Do you consider your communications with other director to be adversary in nature?*	40 71.4%	16 28.6%	11 44.0%	14 56.0%

*Number of responses limited due to omission of the word "adversary" in the first mailing.

The data within Table 17 indicate that executive directors feel more strongly that problems could be averted with better communication between directors. The executive directors feel they initiate most communication between the directors and feel that the director of special education should communicate more. The directors of special education indicate that their programs have been changed as a result of communication more often than the executive director; and, the directors of special education feel more strongly than the executive directors that the communication has provided a good working relationship.

The data within the three sections, Overview, Responsibilities, and Communication, indicate that the two categories of directors: serve similar demographic objectives of service; have similar job responsibilities; have similar evaluations of actual and desired frequency of

communication; and, have similar evaluations of the value of communication. The question then, if all the above is considered valid data, is what can be projected as the effect of these data on a cooperative effort to provide a comprehensive set of services to mentally retarded citizens?

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The objective of this study was to provide insights into the two categories of local directors which could help promote cooperative effort to provide a comprehensive set of services to mentally retarded citizens. The objective of this study has been achieved. The insights gained based on the data are, in this investigator's opinion, best discussed within the framework of Graham's (1962) three barriers to the achievement of public education for mentally retarded children. The barriers were, (1) misconception as to purpose or plan, (2) conformity to past patterns and established beliefs, and (3) lethargy of action. These barriers were developed at a time in the history of special education when the climate for action was defined by local educators who would not act due to the limitations of finance, facilities, personnel, and community attitude. Parents, who banded together and became an informed advocacy movement, suspected they had the right to expect a free and public education for their mentally retarded children. Under parental pressure the states' general assemblies and the courts verified the suspicions of the parents. Mandates for public education for mentally retarded citizens became reality in the 1970's. This study, due to inherent design faults, cannot lead to definitive answers to these questions. The results lead this investigator to believe that the three barriers still exist; the location of the barriers, as could be placed by the results of this investigation, have been further defined to fit the climate of the 1970's.

Both categories of directors reported that education is the prime characteristic of their agency's services. Executive directors ranked advocacy as less characteristic of their agency than did directors of special education. Neither category of the director reported a high level of actual or desired frequency of communication concerning current or planned strategies of the other director's agency. And, neither category of director reported frequent attendance at the other director's formal meetings.

This investigator speculates that these disparities are contributing factors to what Graham called "misconception as to purpose or plan." The data seem to indicate two sets of professional workers who perceive themselves responsible for the same services. Yet, they seem to see little or no need to communicate or to be knowledgeable of the other director's plans or strategies.

Both categories of director report that increased communication could aid in better evaluation of programs and the evaluation of community needs for services. Yet, they report actual communication contacts as infrequent and are almost evenly split within each category in their reported desire to communicate more frequently or to maintain current levels of communication.

This investigator speculates that these disparities are the result of what Graham called, "conformity to past patterns and established beliefs." The two categories of directors have each developed a set of direct services to mentally retarded citizens. Both categories of directors reported these services a primarily educational in nature. To open one's services to the scrutiny of a fellow professional who is delivering similar services and who had been an adversary in the past might be perceived as disruptive to the efforts of the present.

Data on the category of "Law Related Responsibilities" indicate a disparity of perceptions and a wide range of reported responsibilities for both categories of directors. Neither director reported a high level of responsibility for the coordination of client services through cooperative community agencies. Neither

category of director reported receiving frequent communication contacts seeking assistance from the other director.

The data indicate support for Graham's statement, "lethargy of action." "Reactive" abilities in law all elicited higher responses in perceived and actual responsibilities than did those which required "leadership," "development," and "lobbying." Leadership by definition requires action. The citation above, in this investigator's opinion, is indicative of non-leadership or lethargy.

The two categories of directors indicated an underestimated perception of each other's job responsibilities. They further stated that they "sometimes" or "never" communicate their plans or strategies to the other director. And, both cited education as the prime activity of their respective agency. Such information could lead an interpreter to conclude that the two systems are proceeding toward a common objective for a common population with minimal knowledge of what the other system is doing. This activity can lead to:

1. duplication of services
2. competition for clientele
3. wasted resources
4. lack of comprehensive services.

If there is a way to change the present pattern it must be found by an effort to change current practices, to identify proper roles based on the overall needs of mentally retarded citizens, to plan activities aimed at meeting the needs, and to overcome the new barriers defined by the new plans. Advocacy by vested interests, direct services in the public sector, and direct services in the private sector all have roles

in this cooperative effort. Moreover, the two categories of directors need to be leaders.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was undertaken to determine similarities and differences between two categories of local professional workers, directors of public school special education programs and executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens. Data reported were gathered through the use of the questionnaire method. Questionnaires were mailed to local directors in each category who were currently members of the Council of Administrators of Special Education (C.A.S.E.) and the Council of Executives of Associations for Retarded Citizens (C.E.A.R.C.) within Region Five of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin). The total response to the questionnaire was 176 (55.7 percent). Data were reported in tables with responses tabulated by percentage comparisons, raw data, and means of weighted responses.

Findings

The major findings of this study were:

1. Directors of special education perceived the other director as having less responsibility in six of the nine categories studied; evaluated on the forty-five individual items, directors of special education perceived the other director as having less responsibility in 83.7 percent of responses and as having more responsibility in 16.3 percent of responses.

2. Executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens perceived the other director as having less responsibility in seven of the nine categories studied; evaluated on the forty-five individual items, executive directors perceive the other director as having less responsibility in 78.8 percent of responses and as having more responsibility in 21.4 percent of responses.

3. Both categories of directors reported that the actual frequency of communication, within the categories studied, was in the range of "sometimes" to "never".

Conclusions and Implications

Based on the findings of this study it was concluded that: Services for mentally retarded citizens would be enhanced by more frequent communication between the two categories of directors.

1. Possible duplication of services could be avoided by communication between the two categories of directors.

2. Possible competition for clientele could be avoided by communication between the two directors.

3. Resources could be better utilized through communication and cooperation between the two directors.

4. Comprehensive services could be better developed as a result of communication and cooperation between directors.

Suggestions for Future Research

The results of this study might lead future investigators to seek answers to such questions as:

1. What public or private or volunteer agencies are perceived by both categories of directors as being barriers to comprehensive services for mentally retarded citizens?
2. What is the frequency of duplication of services between the public schools and the Association for Retarded Citizens?
3. What is the status of the role of "advocate" within Associations for Retarded Citizens?
4. How do the categories of directors perceive that they might work together cooperatively to achieve coordinated services for mentally retarded citizens?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- C.E.C. Policy statement on governmental affairs. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 85-89.
- Connor, L. E. Administration of special education programs. New York: Teachers College Press, 1961.
- Dybwad, G. Cooperation among volunteer health organizations. Chicago: National Institute of Services for Handicapped Children and Youth, 1963.
- Future of the voluntary service organization. Social Work, 1973, 18, 59-69.
- Graff, O. W. and Street, C. M. Improving competence in educational administration. In L. L. Waters, Employing officials and doctoral graduates perceptions of special education competencies in three midwestern states. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.
- Graham, R. Responsibility of public education for exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 1962, 28, 255-259.
- Katz, A. H. Parents of the handicapped. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1961.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Kidd, J. W. The organization of special education services. In C. H. Meisgeier and J. D. King (Eds.), The process of special education administration. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook, Co., 1970.
- Kohl, J. W. and Marro, T. D. A normative study of the administrative position in special education. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Project No. 482266) Washington: Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, 1971.
- Krishef, C. H. and Menefee, A. R. A survey of programs and services of 488 local member units of the National Association for Retarded children. New York: National Association for Retarded Children, Inc., 1966.
- Lippman, L. and Goldberg, I. I. Right to education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1973.
- Mackie, R. P. and Engle, A. M. Directors and supervisors of special education in local school systems. U.S. Office of Education Bulletin 1955, No. 13, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1956.

- Marro T. D., and Kohl, J. W. A normative study of the administrative position in special education. Exceptional Children, 1972, 38, 5-8.
- Mead, M., and Brown, M. The wagon and the star. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Meisgeier, C. H., and Sloat, R. Common and specialized learnings, competencies, and experiences for special education administrators. Austin, Texas: University of Texas at Austin Press, 1970.
- Miller, S. M., and Rein, M. Participation, poverty and administration. Public Administration Review, 1969, 29, 15-24.
- Mintzberg, H. The nature of managerial work. Management Science, 1966.
- Newman, K. S. Administrative tasks in special education. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 521-524.
- Patterson, L. L. Some pointers for professionals. Children, 1956, 3, 13-17.
- Roos, P. Parent organizations. In J. Wortis (Ed.), Mental retardation: an annual review (Vol. 2). New York: Grune and Stratton, 1970.
- Rothstein, J. H. Mental retardation. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Schroeder, H. J. The projected impact of mandatory legislation on special education programs in Indiana. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.
- Segal, M. S. Associations for retarded children: a force for social change. In J. Wortis (Ed.), Mental retardation: an annual review (Vol. 2). New York: Grune and Stratton, 1970.
- Walsh, G. F. When you employ an executive director. New York: National Association for Retarded Children, Inc., 1969.
- Waters, L. L. Employing officials and doctoral graduates perceptions of special education competencies in three midwestern states. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1974.
- Willower, D. J. Special education: organization and administration. Exceptional Children, 1970, 36, 591-594.
- Wisland, M. V., and Vaughan, T. Administrative problems in special education. Exceptional Children, 1964, 31, 87-89.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

SPECIAL EDUCATION DISTRICT
LAKE COUNTY

4440 West Grand Avenue
GURNIE, ILLINOIS 60051

L. D. Vuillemot, Director
M. V. Brown
Business Administrator

Telephone 312 625-0021

December 19, 1975

Dear Director of Special Education:

Enclosed you will find a duplicate of a questionnaire which was initially distributed in October 1975. Significant of this questionnaire is:

1. the research has been approved by your professional organization, C.A.S.E.
2. the questionnaire requires only about 20 minutes of your time.
3. the questionnaire asks about:
 - 3.1 you and your role
 - 3.2 your perceptions of your local executive director of the Association for Retarded Citizens.

Please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope before January 31, 1976.

Thank you for your effort.

Sincerely yours,

SPECIAL EDUCATION DISTRICT
OF LAKE COUNTY

James F. Dyk

James F. Dyk
Administrative Intern

JFD:jh

enclosure:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

School of Education

EDUCATION BUILDING
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

DEPARTMENT OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

TEL. NO. 612-337-0231
337-3563

October 8, 1973

TO: Directors of Special Education
Executive Directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens

FROM: James Dyk, Doctoral Candidate
Philip R. Jones, Research Director
Indiana University

SUBJECT: Directors of Special Education/Executive Directors of Associations
for Retarded Citizens: Responsibilities and Interactions

- 1.0 Before you blanch at the request that follows please remember, someone helped you in your school work.
- 2.0 Your roles related to the enclosed questionnaire are:
 - 2.1 Responder: "Who are you" and "What your agency or system does?"
 - 2.2 Responder: "What you do to keep your agency or system in operation?"
 - 2.3 Responder: "What competencies you think the other director needs to keep his agency or system in operation?"
 - 2.4 Responder: "What is the frequency and quality of the communication between you and the other director?"
- 3.0 Facts you need to know:
 - 3.1 Your professional association, C.A.S.E. or C.E.A.R.C., is aware of this research project and supports the concept.
 - 3.2 The Bureau of Education of the Handicapped (U.S.O.E.) has opted to support this research.
 - 3.3 In a pilot study your peers rated the research as potentially valuable.
 - 3.4 The pilot study showed that the questionnaire could be completed in less than 30 minutes.
- 4.0 Directions:
 - 4.1 Complete the questionnaire.
 - 4.11 Remember, read the objectives at the start of each of the three sections.

- 4.2 Enclose the completed questionnaire in the envelope and mail it by _____.
- 4.3 If you should lose the envelope, mail the completed questionnaire to:

James Dyk
905 Baldwin
Apartment 7A
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

- 4.4 Follow-up procedures will be initiated two days after the requested return date above (4.2).

Thank you for your cooperation in this research.

JD:jh

SECTION IPERSONAL DATA**1.0 OBJECTIVES:**

- 1.1 To gather general data indicative of likenesses and differences of the people serving in the two roles.
- 1.2 To gather basic descriptive data concerning the service area of each respondent.
- 1.3 To gather basic client served data within programming for mentally retarded citizens.
- 1.4 To gather basic descriptive data on the type of programming available to mentally retarded citizens.

2.0 YOUR ROLE:

- 2.1 Responder: "Who are you" and "What your agency or system does?"

1. How long have you served in your present job? _____ years _____ months. ⁶²

2. What is your age? 21 - 25 _____; 26 - 30 _____; 31 - 35 _____; 36 - 40 _____;
41 - 45 _____; 46 - 50 _____; 51 - 55 _____; 56 - 60 _____;
61 - 65 _____; over 65 _____.

What is your sex? Female _____ Male _____

3. Do you now or have you ever qualified for Department of Public Instruction certification(s) or license(s)? _____ yes _____ no

If yes, what certification(s) or license(s)?
_____, _____, _____

4. Have you ever been employed as an administrator in any public agency other than your current position? _____ yes _____ no

If yes, what agency? _____

Job title? _____

5. Have you ever been employed as an administrator in any private organization, business, or corporation? _____ yes _____ no

6. What was the job title of your most recent past employment situation?

_____, _____, _____
(title) (employer) (prime responsibility)

7. What is your formal training?

	Major	Minor	Hours past last degree
High School graduate _____			
Bachelor's (BA/BS/etc.) _____	_____	_____	_____
Master's (MA/MS/etc.) _____	_____	_____	_____
Specialist (Ed.S.) _____	_____	_____	_____
Doctor's (Ed.D/Ph.D.) _____	_____	_____	_____

8. Does one of your own children qualify for services to mentally retarded citizens? _____ yes _____ no

9. Which meetings do you attend? (often = 80% or more of schedule meetings)

School Board.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
A.R.C. Board.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
A.R.C. Membership.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
City Council.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
County Board.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
State Legislative Committees.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
Local committee for exceptional citizens.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
Local service clubs.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____
Joint Agreement Board.....	often _____	sometimes _____	never _____

9.1 Circle the meeting(s) above in which attendance is required as part of your job.

10. My service area has a population of:

500,000 plus _____
 250,000 to 499,999 _____
 100,000 to 249,999 _____
 50,000 to 99,999 _____
 10,000 to 49,999 _____
 up to 9,999 _____

primarily urban (60% or more) _____
 primarily rural (60% or more) _____

school age _____
 school age: _____
 mentally retarded _____

11. How would you characterize your agency's services to mentally retarded citizens? (Rank appropriate descriptors) (1 = most descriptive of your agency; 10 = least descriptive of your agency)

advocacy _____
 central referral agency _____
 educational _____
 parent training _____
 recreational _____
 rehabilitative _____
 residential _____
 summer activities _____
 total family support _____
 vocational training _____
 community education _____
 protective services _____
 financial aid _____
 legal aid _____

12. Have your services to mentally retarded citizens been the subject of litigation? _____ yes _____ no

12.1 Have your services resulted in a threat of litigation? _____ yes _____ no

12.2 By whom? Parent(s)? _____ Advocacy Agency? _____ Other? _____

12.3 Has the situation changed as a result of the litigation or threat of litigation? _____ yes _____ no

12.4 (optional) What was the reason for the litigation or threat of litigation? _____

NOTE:

When returned, this page will be removed to
assure confidentiality and anonymity.

NAME _____
(Last) (First) (Middle)

BUSINESS ADDRESS _____
(Street) (City) (State)

POSITION/TITLE _____

NAME OF DIRECTOR(S) OF SPECIAL EDUCATION OR EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS OF
ASSOCIATIONS FOR RETARDED CITIZENS IN YOUR SERVICE AREA. (IF YOU ARE
WITH THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THEN PLEASE LIST A.R.C. PEOPLE; IF YOU ARE A.R.C.
THEN PLEASE LIST PUBLIC SCHOOL PEOPLE.)

(Name) (Association or District)

(Name) (Association or District)

(Name) (Association or District)

SECTION IIRESPONSIBILITIES

1.0 OBJECTIVES:

- 1.1 To gather specific data relevant to the responsibilities of a specific director in his own job.
- 1.2 To gather specific data relevant to the responsibilities of a specific director as perceived by another director, you.

2.0 YOUR ROLES:

- 2.1 Responder: "What do you do to keep you agency or system in operation?"
- 2.2 Responder: "What competencies you think the other director needs to keep that agency or system in operation?"

IMPORTANT CONCEPTS IN YOUR COMPLETION OF SECTION II

"OTHER DIRECTOR"

The target populations of this research are local directors of special education and local executive directors of Associations for Retarded Citizens. If you are a local director of special education then the "other director" is the local executive director of the Association for Retarded Citizens. If you are a local Association for Retarded Citizens executive, then the "other director" is the local director of special education.

"IN THE OTHER DIRECTOR'S JOB"

Your perceptions of the responsibilities required of the "other director" in the accomplishment of his job are sought.

	<u>IN MY JOB</u>			<u>IN THE OTHER DIRECTOR'S JOB</u>		
	--prime importance	--medium importance	--no importance	--prime importance	--medium importance	--no importance
A. <u>FISCAL RESPONSIBILITIES:</u>						
1. Administer agency or system budget	1.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		1.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
2. Develop accounting procedures for funds expended in the operation of programs	2.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		2.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
3. Translate program(s) into an annual budget	3.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		3.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
4. Develop and administer state or federal grant-in-aid proposals	4.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		4.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
B. <u>RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES:</u>						
1. Conduct formal research concerning your services	1.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		1.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
2. Identify sources and requirements for external funding	2.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		2.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
3. Apply the results of research	3.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		3.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
4. Develop appropriate curriculum guides for courses of experience	4.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		4.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	
5. Implement innovative projects	5.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :		5.	__ : __ : __ : __ : __ :	

IN MY JOB

IN THE OTHER
DIRECTOR'S JOB

--prime
importance
--medium
importance
--no
importance

--prime
importance
--medium
importance
--no
importance

6. Plan for continuous evaluation of curriculum

6. __:__:__:__:__:

6. __:__:__:__:__:

C. TRANSPORTATION RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Assess transportation needs

1. __:__:__:__:__:

1. __:__:__:__:__:

2. Arrange for the selection, training, and supervision of personnel who perform the functions of the transportation system

2. __:__:__:__:__:

2. __:__:__:__:__:

3. Prepare transportation schedules

3. __:__:__:__:__:

3. __:__:__:__:__:

D. LAW RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES:

1. Comply with and enforce state standards for the program operation and certification

1. __:__:__:__:__:

1. __:__:__:__:__:

2. Stimulate the development of needed legislation

2. __:__:__:__:__:

2. __:__:__:__:__:

3. Be conversant in the history, issues, and philosophy of law as it applies to mentally retarded citizens and program operation

3. __:__:__:__:__:

3. __:__:__:__:__:

4. Participate in the interpretation of law into rules and regulations

4. __:__:__:__:__:

4. __:__:__:__:__:

5. Lobby

5. __:__:__:__:__:

5. __:__:__:__:__:

IN MY JOBIN THE OTHER
DIRECTOR'S JOB

--prime
importance
--medium
importance
--no
importance

--prime
importance
--medium
importance
--no
importance

E. CLIENT OR STUDENT PERSONNEL RESPONSIBILITIES:

- | | | |
|---|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Organize arrangements for effective counseling and guidance of clients and/or families | 1. ____:____:____:____:____: | 1. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 2. Develop a functional system of evaluating client development | 2. ____:____:____:____:____: | 2. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 3. Develop a functional system of reporting client development | 3. ____:____:____:____:____: | 3. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 4. Establish methods for coordination of services through cooperative community agencies | 4. ____:____:____:____:____: | 4. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 5. Develop procedures for identifying children needing special programs | 5. ____:____:____:____:____: | 5. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 6. Develop policies for the management of student or client records | 6. ____:____:____:____:____: | 6. ____:____:____:____:____: |

F. STAFF PERSONNEL AND DEVELOPMENT RESPONSIBILITIES:

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 1. Plan for recruitment, placement and transfer of staff | 1. ____:____:____:____:____: | 1. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 2. Evaluate personnel | 2. ____:____:____:____:____: | 2. ____:____:____:____:____: |
| 3. Insure awareness of professional standards and ethics | 3. ____:____:____:____:____: | 3. ____:____:____:____:____: |

IN MY JOB

IN THE OTHER
DIRECTOR'S JOB

--prime
importance
--medium
importance
--no
importance

--prime
importance
--medium
importance
--no
importance

- | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 4. Develop and review personnel policies | 4. _:_:_:_:_: | 4. _:_:_:_:_: |
| 5. Motivate staff to seek professional growth experiences (e.g., classes, workshops, conferences...) | 5. _:_:_:_:_: | 5. _:_:_:_:_: |
| 6. Identify need and be involved in planning for in-service training | 6. _:_:_:_:_: | 6. _:_:_:_:_: |
| 7. Maintain personnel records | 7. _:_:_:_:_: | 7. _:_:_:_:_: |

G. NEGOTIATIONS RESPONSIBILITIES:

- | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Participate in program or service oriented negotiations with other professional organizations (e.g., N.E.A., AFL/CIO,...) | 1. _:_:_:_:_: | 1. _:_:_:_:_: |
| 2. Participate in professional salary and wage related negotiations with system personnel | 2. _:_:_:_:_: | 2. _:_:_:_:_: |
| 3. Communicate the needs of the negotiating body to a governing board or school board (e.g., formal presentation, written report,...) | 3. _:_:_:_:_: | 3. _:_:_:_:_: |

H. COMMUNITY RELATIONS RESPONSIBILITIES:

- | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Carry out a continuous program of community education to professional and lay people (e.g., speeches, films, speakers, bureau,...) | 1. _:_:_:_:_: | 1. _:_:_:_:_: |
|---|---------------|---------------|

IN MY JOB

IN THE OTHER DIRECTOR'S JOB

- | | | --prime
importance | --medium
importance | --no
importance | | --prime
importance | --medium
importance | --no
importance |
|---|----|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|----|-----------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| 2. Develop appropriate publications, brochures, and other written materials communicating agency or system services to the local public | 2. | __ | __ | __ | 2. | __ | __ | __ |
| 3. Promote understanding of and support for programs for mentally retarded citizens through speeches | 3. | __ | __ | __ | 3. | __ | __ | __ |
| 4. Establish channels of communication for interpretation of programs to parents | 4. | __ | __ | __ | 4. | __ | __ | __ |

I. MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES:

- | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1. Develop strategies for future programs or services | 1. | __ | __ | __ | 1. | __ | __ | __ |
| 2. Plan strategies when working with large bureaucratic organizations | 2. | __ | __ | __ | 2. | __ | __ | __ |
| 3. Analyze who holds the power in specific situations | 3. | __ | __ | __ | 3. | __ | __ | __ |
| 4. Draw upon others' expertise to aid in planning | 4. | __ | __ | __ | 4. | __ | __ | __ |
| 5. Establish and evaluate management objectives | 5. | __ | __ | __ | 5. | __ | __ | __ |
| 6. Coordinate the expenditure of various resources | 6. | __ | __ | __ | 6. | __ | __ | __ |
| 7. Motivate staff to accomplish organizational objectives | 7. | __ | __ | __ | 7. | __ | __ | __ |

SECTION IIICOMMUNICATIONS

1.0 OBJECTIVES:

- 1.1 To gather specific data relevant to the frequency of communication between the two directors.
- 1.2 To gather specific data relevant to the quality of communication between the two directors.

2.0 YOUR ROLE:

- 2.1 Responder: "What is the frequency and quality of the communication between you and the other director?"

ACTUAL
FREQUENCY

DESIRED
FREQUENCY

--weekly
--bi-monthly
--monthly
--sometimes
--never
--should be
more
--adequate in
number
--I receive
none

COMMUNICATION:

Communications with the "OTHER DIRECTOR" which:

- | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Provide information about the other director's current strategies | telephone | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | written | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | in-person | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| 2. Provide information about the other director's (system) (agency) long-range strategies | telephone | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | written | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | in-person | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| 3. Are primarily of a "newsy" or "newsletter" type which is available to the general public | telephone | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | written | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | in-person | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| 4. React positively to a specific action which you or your (agency) (system) has taken | telephone | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | written | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | in-person | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| 5. React negatively to a specific action you or your (agency) (system) has taken | telephone | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | written | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | in-person | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| 6. Request your aid in a specific matter relevant to an action of the other (agency) (system) | telephone | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | written | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |
| | in-person | ___:___:___:___:___: | ___:___:___:___:___: |

K. GENERAL COMMUNICATIONS:

1. In the past year could problems have been averted with better communication with the other director? yes _____ no _____
2. Have your programs for the mentally retarded been enhanced as a result of communication with the other director? yes _____ no _____
3. Do you think you could better evaluate your programs for the mentally retarded as a result of increased communication with the other director? yes _____ no _____
4. Do you think you might better evaluate the community needs for services to mentally retarded citizens with increased communication with the other director? yes _____ no _____
5. Do you initiate most communication between the schools and the A.R.C.? yes _____ no _____
6. Do you think the other director should communicate with you more often? yes _____ no _____
7. Have you implemented any change in your programs as a result of communication with the other director? yes _____ no _____
8. Do you feel that communications with the other director have provided a good working relationship between the two of you? yes _____ no _____
9. Are your communications with the other director primarily a result of membership on the other director's program advisory committee? yes _____ no _____
10. Do you consider your communications with the other director to be adversary in nature? yes _____ no _____

NOTE: Thank you for your honest participation in this research. Return the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided and mail it. In case you have misplaced the return envelope please return to: James Dyk
905 Baldwin, Apt. 7A
Waukegan, Illinois 60085

COMMENTS: This space is provided for your comments. On-task commentary related to any facet of the questionnaire is welcome.

Appendix B

TABLE A
LENGTH OF SERVICE OF DIRECTORS IN THEIR PRESENT POSITION

	Director of Sp. Ed.	Ex. Director-A.R.C.
0 - 2 years	31 (23.9%)	8 (25.0%)
2 - 4 years	28 (21.5%)	12 (37.5%)
4 - 8 years	38 (29.2%)	8 (25.0%)
8 - 12 years	21 (16.2%)	3 (9.4%)
12 + years	12 (9.2%)	1 (3.1%)
	N=130	N=32

TABLE B
SEX OF DIRECTORS

Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
Female	Male	Female	Male
28 (22.4%)	97 (77.6%)	6 (18.8%)	26 (81.3%)
N=125		N=32	

TABLE C
AGES OF DIRECTORS

Years	Director of Sp. Ed.	Ex. Director-A.R.C.
21-25	0	0
26-30	10 (8.0%)	8 (24.2%)
31-35	23 (18.4%)	7 (21.2%)
36-40	16 (12.8%)	4 (12.1%)
41-45	29 (23.2%)	4 (12.1%)
46-50	25 (20.0%)	6 (18.2%)
51-55	15 (12.0%)	3 (9.1%)
56-60	6 (4.8%)	4 (3.0%)
61-65	1 (0.8%)	0
over 65	0	0
N=125		N=33

TABLE D
MENTALLY RETARDED CHILD IN DIRECTOR'S FAMILY

Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
4	119	1	30
(3.3%)	(96.8%)	(3.2%)	(96.8%)
N=123		N=31	

TABLE E
CERTIFICATION BY A DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
131	1	14	20
(99.2%)	(0.8%)	(41.2%)	(58.8%)

N=132

N=34

Note: Executive directors of A.R.C.'s have no comparable certification agency.

TABLE F
CATEGORIES OF CERTIFICATION BY A DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

	Director of Sp. Ed.*	Ex. Director-A.R.C.
Special Ed.	63 (47.7%)	6 (17.6%)
El. Ed.	47 (35.6%)	1 (2.9%)
Sec. Ed.	14 (10.6%)	2 (5.9%)
Support Service	46 (34.8%)	2 (5.9%)
Administrative	78 (59.1%)	2 (5.9%)
Superintendent	10 (7.6%)	0

N=132

N=34

*(many directors report holding dual certification--all certifications reported are logged--Percents are computed based on the number of respondents divided into the number reporting certification, therefore, percents may total beyond 100%)

TABLE G

AGENCY SERVICES SUBJECT TO LITIGATION

Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
12	116	2	30
(9.4%)	(90.6%)	(6.3%)	(93.7%)

N=128

N=32

TABLE H

AGENCY SERVICES SUBJECT TO THREATENED LITIGATION

Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
33	87	4	29
(27.5%)	(72.5%)	(12.1%)	(87.9%)

N=120

N=33

TABLE I
PLAINTIFF IN THREATENED OR ACTUAL LITIGATION

	Director of Sp. Ed.	Ex. Director-A.R.C.
Parents	34	4
Advocacy Agency	7	
Other	2	1

TABLE J
AGENCY PRACTICES OR PROCEDURES CHANGED AS A RESULT
OF THREATENED OR ACTUAL LITIGATION

Director of Special Education		Executive Director of A.R.C.	
yes	no	yes	no
15	19	3	1
(44.1%)	(55.9%)	(75.0%)	(25.0%)

TABLE K
SERVICE AREA POPULATION AND DEMOGRAPHICS

	Director of Sp. Ed.	Ex. Director-A.R.C.
500,000 plus	6 (4.7%)	33 (9.4%)
250,000-499,999	6 (4.7%)	3 (9.4%)
100,000-249,999	22 (17.3%)	12 (37.5%)
50,000-99,999	32 (25.2%)	9 (28.1%)
10,000-49,999	52 (40.9%)	5 (15.6%)
up to 9,999	9 (7.1%)	0
	N=127	N=32
Primarily Urban	74 (58.3%)	16 (53.3%)
Primarily Rural	53 (41.7%)	14 (46.7%)
	N=127	N=30

TABLE L
COMMUNICATION OF A "NEWSY" OR NEWSLETTER TYPE

	Director of Special Education									Executive Director - A.R.C.								
	Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency				Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency			
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none		Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none	
Tele-phone	0	3	5	24	52	19	37	20		1	1	0	10	19	12	9	9	
Written	0	5	34	37	36	30	60	12		0	2	8	7	13	10	11	8	
In-person	0	2	4	26	49	18	40	16		1	1	2	10	16	12	8	10	

TABLE M
COMMUNICATION WHICH IS NEGATIVE

	Director of Special Education									Executive Director - A.R.C.								
	Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency				Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency			
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none		Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none	
Tele-phone	4	2	4	55	41	20	53	21		1	1	0	17	13	10	16	5	
Written	3	1	2	39	52	22	47	19		0	0	0	11	21	9	14	8	
In-person	4	1	7	51	39	24	48	18		1	1	1	13	16	9	15	7	

TABLE N
COMMUNICATION WHICH IS POSITIVE

	Director of Special Education								Executive Director - A.R.C.							
	Actual Frequency				Desired Frequency				Actual Frequency				Desired Frequency			
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none
Tele- phone	5	8	9	59	28	33	55	11	2	1	3	15	11	15	12	4
Written	2	0	6	51	37	36	45	11	0	0	2	13	17	12	11	8
In- person	4	9	13	51	31	33	54	9	2	1	3	18	8	13	12	6

TABLE O
COMMUNICATION CONCERNING CURRENT STRATEGIES

	Director of Special Education								Executive Director - A.R.C.							
	Actual Frequency				Desired Frequency				Actual Frequency				Desired Frequency			
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none
Tele- phone	11	13	10	51	31	36	56	14	2	4	4	16	6	18	13	1
Written	2	2	7	63	33	31	55	11	0	1	1	15	15	13	14	5
In- person	6	13	17	44	35	34	58	6	1	2	9	16	4	15	15	2

TABLE P
COMMUNICATION CONCERNING LONG-RANGE STRATEGIES

	Director of Special Education									Executive Director - A.R.C.							
	Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency				Actual Frequency					Desired Frequency		
	Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none		Weekly	Bi-weekly	Monthly	Sometimes	Never	Should be more	Adequate in number	I receive none
Tele- phone	1	6	13	48	43	33	53	16		1	1	2	16	12	19	10	3
Written	1	0	9	54	40	34	48	13		1	0	2	10	19	14	11	7
In- person	1	5	20	53	35	35	57	8		1	1	3	16	11	19	9	4